28

DAWYN R. HARRISON, County Counsel 1 STARR COLEMAN, Assistant County Counsel THOMAS R. PARKER, Senior Deputy County Counsel (SBN 141835) • TParker@counsel.lacounty.gov 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 3 500 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012-2713 Telephone: (213) 974-1834 4 5 Facsimile: (213) 613-4751 Thomas C. Hurrell, State Bar No. 119876 E-Mail: thurrell@hurrellcantrall.com Jonathan Fang, State Bar No. 279106 E-Mail: jfang@hurrellcantrall.com HURRELL CANTRALL LLP 725 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3800 Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 426-2000 Facsimile: (213) 426-2020 **10** Attorneys for Defendants, CLARK R. TAYLOR, AICP, THE LOS ANGELES 11 COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING 12 **13** UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION 14 15 CLINTON BROWN, Case No. 2:22-cv-09203-MEMF-KS **16 DECLARATION OF JONATHAN** Plaintiff, **17** FANG, ESQ. ISO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S **18** v. THIRD MOTION FOR CLARK R. TAYLOR, AICP, THE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF 19 LOS ANGELES COÚNTY DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL **20** Assigned to: PLANNING, Hon. Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong Courtroom "8B" 21 Defendants. Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson 22 Courtroom "580" 23 I, Jonathan Fang, declare as follows: 24 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice before this Court and am an associate with Hurrell Cantrall LLP, attorneys of record for Defendant Clark R. Taylor. AICP. The Los Angeles 25 26 County Department of Regional Planning herein. The facts set forth herein are of my own personal knowledge and if sworn I could and would testify competently thereto. 27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

**16** 

**17** 

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**26** 

27

28

- 2. Plaintiff Clinton Brown never contacted Defendant's counsel to inform us of his intention to file his Third Notice of Motion for Injunctive Relief (Dkt 65) or to discuss the substance of his motion and any potential resolution.
- 3. Plaintiff Clinton Brown never contacted Defendant's counsel to inform us of his intention to file his Motions for Docket 42 and Docket 59 or to discuss the substance of any of the aforementioned motions and any potential resolution.
- 4. Plaintiff's serial motion and filings continue to be vexatious and frivolous and create an unnecessary burden on the time and resource of Defendant.
- 5. Following the Court's Minute Order (Dkt 66), Defense Counsel spoke to Plaintiff telephonically regarding Plaintiff's failure to provide discovery responses and produce documents in response to Defendant's Request for Production of Documents, Set One. Plaintiff stated that the Order did not require him to adhere to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34(b)(2) and provide a responses and/or documents to the outstanding discovery requests because according to Plaintiff they are "not relevant." Plaintiff stated that the Minute Order (Dkt 66) gave Plaintiff "time to refile" his Motion to limit discovery (Dkt 41) and that Defendant was "not going to get anything from me or my family" in regards to the documents requested. Plaintiff's responses to Defendant's Request for Production of Documents, Set One were due on April 20, 2023. Plaintiff's Motion to limit discovery (Dkt 41) was denied without prejudice on July 13, 2023 (Dkt 66). The Court explicitly reminded Plaintiff under Rule 37, that "he has an obligation to serve any objections and/or responses to Defendant's discovery requests within the established deadlines unless the parties have otherwise agreed." Yet, as of the date of this declaration, Plaintiff continues to refuse to provide any discovery responses or documents to Defendant.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 31, 2023, at Los Angeles, California.

Jonathan Fang

Jonathan Fang